| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/804,600 | 03/18/2004 | Mikko Lonnfors | NOKM.019C1 | 9543 |

7590          06/27/2008

Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC
Suite 125
8009 34th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55425

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| BLAIR, DOUGLAS B |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2142 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 06/27/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 March 2004</u>.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**     2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
     closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
          application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/08, 8/07, 2/07, 10/05, 3/04</u>.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

This application is a continuation of application number 10/196,327 (Patent Number

6,757,722).

### *Double Patenting*

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees.  A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-18 and 32 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double

patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 and 26 of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,722.  Although

the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

the present application is claiming mediums and signals carrying out identical methods to those

claimed in the '722 patent.  The claimed mediums and signals do not patentably distinguish the

claims.  Claims 1-16 of the present application are directed towards a medium that implements

an identical method to claims 1-16 of the '722 patent. Claim 17 of the present application is

directed towards a medium that implements an identical method to claim 17 of the '722 patent.

Claim 18 of the present application is directed towards a signal embodying a program that

implements an identical method to claim 1 of the '722 patent. Claim 32 of the present

application is a broader version of claim 26 of the '722 patent, the only difference being that that

the present claim 32 does not explicitly state that the partial presence information is

communicated via the network.

## *Specification*

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the

claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the

following is required: The computer-readable medium claimed in claims 1-17 is not described by

the applicant in the applicant's specification. The specification does mention computer-usable

mediums and transmitting mediums (page 24, lines 15-28).

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101*

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
requirements of this title.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-

statutory subject matter. Claim 1-17 are directed towards a computer-readable medium that may

be interpreted to read on the applicant's disclosed transmitting medium (page 24, lines 15-28),

which is disclosed as being possible data transmissions.  Claim 18 is directed towards a signal.

Data transmissions and signals do not fit into any of the statutory categories of invention.


### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 10-14, 16, and 18-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,658,095 to Yoakum et al.  (Part of the IDS filed on

3/18/2004).

As to claim 1, Yoakum teaches a computer-readable medium having instructions stored

thereon which are executable by a computer system for communicating presence information

between presence servers and terminals coupled to the presence servers via a network by

performing steps comprising: identifying at least one presentity to which a terminal has

requested presence services **(col. 7, lines 10-12 and lines 54-65, the subscribers are requesting**

**presence information)**; creating a presence document including presence information

corresponding to the presentity **(col. 7, lines 45-49, the status information is considered the**

**presence document.  The applicant's specification features no limiting definition for a**

**"presence document")**; configuring the presence information as partial presence information

comprising less than a total of the presence information available for the presentity **(col. 7, lines**

**54-65, the rules are applied to the status information to provide only the information which is requested to the subscribers)**; and communicating the presence document having the partial presence information to the terminal requesting the presence information **(col. 9, lines 4-20, the presence updates based on the rules are provided to a subscribing user)**.

As to claim 2, Yoakum teaches instructions for providing status information for presence information that have changed **(col. 3, lines 47-61)**.

As to claim 4, Yoakum teaches instructions for providing at least one action value in the presence information **(col. 9, lines 4-20)**.

As to claim 10-14, Yoakum teaches instructions for facilitating terminal subscriptions, fetching and polling, providing notifications and providing indications of changes **(See col. 9-12 as cited throughout the office action)**.

As to claim 16, Yoakum teaches instructions for providing a predefined attribute value with the partial presence information **(col. 9, lines 4-20)**.

As to claim 18, it is rejected for the same reasoning as claim 1.

As to claim 19, Yoakum teaches a user equipment terminal, comprising: a processor; a watcher application executable by the processor to generate at least one request for presence information of at least one presentity, and to receive partial presence information including less than the totality of the presence information available for the at least one presentity **(col. 9, lines 4-20, the presence application is considered the watcher and col. 3, lines 47-61 describes partial presence notifications as does col. 4, lines 63-67)**; and a memory to store the presence

information, and to update portions of the presence information identified by the partial presence

information **(col. 9, lines 4-20)**.

As to claim 20, Yoakum teaches a UE terminal as in claim 19, wherein the watcher

application is executable by the processor to generate the at least one request in the form of

subscription request to subscribe to the presence information of the at least one presentity **(col.**

**10, lines 11-16)**.

As to claim 21, Yoakum teaches a UE terminal as in claim 20, wherein the subscription

request comprises a SIP SUBSRIBE method **(col. 10, lines 11-16)**.

As to claim 23, Yoakum teaches a UE terminal as in claim 19, wherein the watcher

application is executable to receive partial presence information by fetching the partial presence

information **(col. 9, lines 4-20)**.

As to claim 24, Yoakum teaches a UE terminal as in claim 19, wherein the watcher

application is executable by the processor to receive the partial presence information via a partial

presence notification identifying the less than the totality of the presence information available

for the at least one presentity **(col. 3, lines 47-61)**.

As to claim 25, Yoakum teaches a UE terminal as in claim 19, wherein the watcher

application is executable by the processor to receive the partial presence information in the form

of a notification message to provide the watcher application with the partial presence information

**(col. 12, lines 10-35)**.

As to claim 26, Yoakum teaches the UE terminal as in claim 25, wherein the notification message comprises a SIP Notify method **(col. 12 lines 10-35)**.

As to claim 27, Yoakum teaches the UE terminal as in claim 19, further comprising a transceiver capable of transmitting the at least one request, and of receiving the partial presence information, via a network **(See Background)**.

As to claims 28-30, Yoakum teaches wireless data transfers via mobile phones and the devices claimed in claim 30 **(See Background)**.

As to claim 31, Yoakum teaches a communication device capable of communicating wirelessly via a network, comprising: a memory configured to store presence information related to one or more presentities **(col. 9, lines 4-20)**; a processor configured to generate a subscription request to subscribe to presence information of a target presentity **(col. 10, lines 11-16)**; a transceiver capable of transmitting the subscription request via the network, and capable of receiving partial presence notifications providing partial change information relating to the presence information of the target presentity **(col. 9, lines 4-20 and col. 3, lines 47-61)**; and wherein the processor is further configured to direct the memory to update the presence information with the partial change information **(col. 9, lines 4-20)**.

As to claim 32, Yoakum teaches a presence server capable of being coupled to a plurality of terminals via a network for communicating presence information to one or more of the plurality of terminals, the presence server comprising: a memory configured to store presence information for a plurality of presentities, and to store terminal subscriptions for terminals authorized to receive the presence information for one or more of the presentities **(col. 9, lines 4-**

**20)**; a processing system coupled to the memory and configured to identify at least one presentity

to which a particular terminal has subscribed, and to create a presence document including the

presence information corresponding to the presentity **(col. 10, lines 11-16)**, wherein the presence

information is configured as partial presence information corresponding to a subset of a set of

presence information available for the presentity **(col. 9, lines 4-20 and col. 3, lines 47-61)**; and

a data transmission module coupled to the processing system and capable of communicating the

partial presence information via the presence document to the subscribing terminal **(col. 9, lines

4-20)**.

## *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent Number 6,658,095 to Yoakum et al.

As to claim 3, Yoakum teaches the method of claim 1, however Yoakum does not

explicitly teach instructions for providing a mode value in the presence information indicative of

whether the presence document includes the partial presence information or the complete

presence information.

Yoakum teaches both the provision of partial and complete presence information and therefore implicitly teaches a mode value.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yoakum regarding complete and partial presence information with the concept of a mode value because providing a mode value would make it clear to the user the type of information that they are otherwise already receiving.

As to claim 5, Yoakum does not explicitly teach the use of CPIM PIDF. Official Notice is taken that CPIM PIDF was a well known format for storing presence information, such as that taught by Yoakum, at the time of the applicant's invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yoakum regarding presence information with CPIM PIDF because CPIM PIDF provides a specific implementation for the teachings of Yoakum that were discussed generically and combining the concepts would produce a predictable result.

Claims 6-8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,658,095 to Yoakum et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0129103 by Birkler.

As to claims 6-8, Yoakum renders obvious the method of claim 5, however, Yoakum does not teach version comparisons.

Birkler teaches the claimed types of version comparisons (paragraphs 20-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yoakum regarding presence notifications with the teachings of Birkler regarding version comparisons because version comparison prevents

unnecessary processing of data. Both Yoakum and Birkler are directed towards the same type of technology so combining the two would produce a predictable result.

As to claim 15, Yoakum does not explicitly teach supplying the presence document in the claimed temporal manners.

Birkler teaches providing a presence document according to predetermined time intervals (See Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yoakum regarding presence notifications with the teachings of Birkler regarding providing a presence document according to predetermined time intervals because doing so provides less burden on the server while providing the client with relatively recent information. Both Yoakum and Birkler are directed towards the same type of technology so combining the two would produce a predictable result.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Claim 17 is allowable over the prior art of record but rejected under Double Patenting and 35 USC 101 rejections as indicated in this action.

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 9 is also subject to rejections based on Double Patenting and 35 USC 101.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: In claim 17, the applicant claims a medium implementing a method which at the client terminal,

compares the version value of presence information with a previously stored version value of

presence information in order to update the presence information at the client terminal. U.S.

Patent Number 6,658,095 to Yoakum teaches the concept of providing partial presence

information (as shown in the rejection of claim 1 in this action) but Yoakum does not teach the

claimed concept of associating the tuple including a version value with the presence information.

U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0129103 by Birkler teaches the idea of

associating a version number with presence information for comparison purposes (paragraphs

20-23) however Birkler makes the comparison of version numbers at the server and not at the

client terminal as claimed. None of the other prior art of record was found to anticipate or make

obvious the subject matter of claim 17. Claim 9 is allowable for the same reason as claim 17.

As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with

all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37

CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).


## *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-

3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


/Douglas B Blair/
Examiner, Art Unit 2142